



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,232	07/31/2001	William J. Ossmann	US010394	5552

7590 08/21/2002  
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Legal Department, DL429  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 7599  
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

919232

Applicant(s)

Ossmann

Examiner

M. Budd

Group Art Unit

2834

---The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address---

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-2-02
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 1, 2, 4-15 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Shimazaki or Kobayashi.

The references teach the claimed structures except for the same specific impedance valves for the matching layer. However, it has long been held that optimization of a known device (e.g. thru routine experimentation) is within the skill expected of the routineer. Thus to ascertain specific optimum valves for any particular application of the devices of Kobayashi or Shimazaki would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 20 and 22, note that it would have been self revealing to an operator if a bone was interfering with imaging the desired organ, and it would then have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to move the probe to a location with a clear view of the desired body part.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimazaki or Kobayashi in view of Slayton or Ishrak.

Shimazaki and Kobayashi teach the transducer using a flat arrangement of the transducer elements. However, each of Slayton and Ishrak teach using either a flat or a curved array of transducer elements depending on the job requirements. Thus, for the reasons taught by Ishrak or Slayton, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Kobayashi or Shimazaki with a curves array.

Regarding applicants comments, it is noted that the material added to independent claims 1 and 18 is admitted prior art (see applicants disclosure page 3). The delay circuits are merely

Art Unit: 2834

one known form of electronic focusing. Thus to use this known means for its intended function would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

  
MARK O. BUDD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 212